

19. A method of making a model from an impression comprising:

- 1) on a tray having an opening with repeating broadened and narrowed regions in said opening, placing a spine in said opening,
- 2) loading stone onto said tray with said spine inserted into said opening,
- 3) forcing said stone loaded onto said tray in step 2 against an impression, and then
- 4) allowing said stone to harden.

20. A method of making a model from an impression comprising:

- 1) sealing the bottom of an opening in a tray having repeating broadened and narrowed regions in said opening
- 2) forcing stone into said opening and onto tray superior surface of said tray against projections on superior surface of said tray,
- 3) allowing stone to partial harden,
- 4) forcing stone on said tray as prepared in steps 1, 2 and 3 against an impression, and
- 5) allowing stone to harden.

---

Response to Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 12-14 have been canceled. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claims 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 have been added. There is one additional independent claim. A check in the amount of \$42.00 is attached in payment therefor.

If further fees are payable, the commissioner is authorized to debit **Deposit Account 08-1652** in the amount required to fully pay all fees.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it is believed the amendments to the claims overcome those rejections.

Regarding the rejections over the art, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 14 have been rejected as anticipated by Cho. The rejection is respectfully traversed. First of all, Cho does not have broadened and narrowed regions that accept a spine or pins. The narrowing is simply the result of indexing spines along the sides of broad opening. The opening would not accept either pins or a spine, as would the opening of the presently claimed invention. Neither does the invention of Cho have the hinge type mechanism claimed in claims 16 and on. Furthermore, there are no projections on the superior surfaces of the trays of Cho to provide stability to the stone on the tray. Hence, it can not be seen that the instantly claimed invention is anticipated by the tray of Cho.

The rejection over Brown is believed moot, in view of the cancellation of claim 5.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (B) as anticipated by Morgensen. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The pins of Morgensen are not inserted in spaces created by broadening and narrowing of a single opening, but are inserted in multiple holes in the bottom of the tray. There is no suggestion therein that pins fitting into broadened areas of a single opening

should be useful for any purpose or how to use them.

Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho in view of Morgensen. The rejection is respectfully traversed. First of all, neither Cho nor Morgenson teach an opening having wider and narrower regions wherein pins can fit in the broadened regions. The pins in Morgenson do not fit into a broadened area of an opening, but each is inserted into a separate, distinct hole in the bottom of the tray. Neither is it seen how one would insert a pin into such a broadened area of a single opening in Cho.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as unpatentable over Cho in view of Zeiser. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims relate to openings wherein the repeating broader (widened) areas can hold pins or a spine. Neither Cho nor Zeiser suggest such an opening, and neither suggests projections on the superior surface of the tray to provide stabilization. No art has been suggested which teaches these limitations of the claims.

It is believed the claims are now in condition for allowance. If discussion would facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at (703) 425-8405.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Glenna Hendricks, Reg. No. 32,535